

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,300	01/20/2006	Masaaki Tanizaki	ASAM.0183	7090
	7590 09/20/2007		EXAMINER	
Stanley P Fisher Reed Smith Hazel & Thomas			TANG, SIGMUND N	
3110 Fairview Park Drive Suite 1400		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Falls Church, VA 22042				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			سك
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	10/565,300	TANIZAKI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sigmund Tang	2612	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address	· · ·
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be a vailable under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by standard patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS atute, cause the application to become ABAND	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this community ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		•	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	0 January 2006.		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ 1	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	wance except for formal matters,	, prosecution as to the mer	its is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11	I, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the applicat 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	drawn from consideration.		
Application Papers	,		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corunt of the corunt	accepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. rection is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.1	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in Appli priority documents have been rec eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage	e
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20 January 2006.	4) Interview Sumr Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	ail Date	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated over Moroto 2. et al. US Patent No 5,121,326.

Re Claim 1, Moroto discloses a summarized map (Moroto, Figure 4(a); Column 6, Lines 13-49) providing guidance (Moroto, Figure 4(a), "dotted line") along a course in a local area by setting a designated point of departure such as the present position of a vehicle (Moroto, Figure 4(a), "arrow") to a destination (Moroto, Figure 4(a), "Circled X"). Moroto further discloses a summarization degree (Moroto, Column 2, Lines 45-55; "scale ratio") that is set in conformity with the distance between the present position of a vehicle to a destination. Moroto further discloses a detecting means of the present position of a vehicle and calculates present position by means of an inputs, steering angle, and information from a range finder (Moroto, Column 9, Lines 12-34). Note: The labeling of a certain map to be a "summarized map" has no bearing on patentability since there is no claimed contrasting of sizes between said summarized map and another map.

Re Claims 2 and 3, claim 3 is a more narrow than claim 2 wherein a priority is set for the limited number of roads and displayed elements based on a summarization

Art Unit: 2612

degree corresponding to the distance from the present position of a vehicle to a destination. Moroto discloses setting a scale ratio for displaying a greater or smaller range of a map (Moroto, Figure 2) of items and ranks roads (Moroto, Figure 3; Column 5, Lines 53-65) in a priority to be displayed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 4-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moroto et al, US Patent No 5,121,326 in further view of Katou et al, US Patent No. 6,006,161.

Re Claims 4-7, Moroto fails to disclose a two-display system. Katou discloses an invention in a similar field of endeavors wherein two screens are used in a vehicle navigation system. Katou discloses a two-screen mode (Katou, Figure 5b) wherein a right screen is in a form of a "present-location" map screen (local plane map) wherein the present position of a vehicle is shown with surrounding objects wherein the left screen is used for displaying maps of greater ranges such as a city map or a schematic diagram (Katou, Column 7, Lines 13-20). A person ordinarily skilled in the art would combine the teachings of Katou and Moroto for the benefit of recognizing a positional relationship of a present vehicle location to a destination with divided screens.

Re Claim 8, Moroto already provides the teaching of a contraction scale (scale ratio) set in conformity to the summarization degree of the distance between a present

Application/Control Number: 10/565,300

Art Unit: 2612

location of a vehicle to a destination, as explained in Re Claims 1, 2 and 3. One ordinarily skilled in the art would utilize said Moroto's teaching and applied to any navigational map like a local area map for the purpose simplifying the display and making it easier for a driver of the vehicle to ascertain the course while driving (Moroto, Column 3, Lines 10-22).

5. Claims 9 & 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moroto et al, US Patent No 5,121,326 in further view of Nakayama et al, US Patent No. 5,732,385.

Re Claims 9 & 10, Claims 9 and 10 are identical to claims 1 & 2 – and are addressed equally above – with the exception of the limited amount of roads and display elements as well as a display range are changed in accordance with the running speed of a vehicle instead of the distance between the present position of a vehicle to a destination. However, Moroto discloses a scale ratio of the range of a map dependant upon the distance between a present position of a vehicle and a destination is silent on having said scale ratio dependant upon the vehicle speed. Nakayama discloses the teaching of varion contract scale ratios can be displayed according to the vehicle speed (Nakayama, Column 8, Lines 11-18; Column 13, Lines 30-36).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sigmund Tang whose telephone number is 571-270-1243. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30-4:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/565,300

Art Unit: 2612

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jeffery Hofsass can be reached at 571-272-2981. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ST

16 September 2007

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Page 5